

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

ASUS TECHNOLOGY LICENSING, INC.,	§	
ET AL.	§	
	§	
v.	§	Case No. 2:23-CV-0486-JRG-RSP
	§	
AT&T, INC., ET AL.		

**Motions Hearing
MAG. JUDGE ROY PAYNE PRESIDING
June 20, 2024**

OPEN: 3:09 pm

ADJOURN: 5:28 pm

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF:	See attached
ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANTS:	See attached
LAW CLERK:	Joshua Scheufler
COURT REPORTER:	Shawn McRoberts
COURTROOM DEPUTY:	Becky Andrews

Court opened. Case called. Charles Ainsworth introduced co-counsel and announced ready. Jennifer Truelove introduced co-counsel and announced ready.

The Court heard arguments on Ericsson's Motion to Intervene (Dkt. No. 54) and Nokia of America Corporation's Motion to Intervene (Dkt. No. 55). Jason Sheasby argued for plaintiff. Nick Mathews argued for defendants. The Court GRANTED the motion under Rule 24(b).

The Court will rule on ASUSTeK Computer, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss Counterclaims against ASUSTeK (Dkt. No. 102) on the briefs.

The parties then argued ASUS Technology Licensing, Inc.'s Motion to Compel Defendants to Produce Source Code Pursuant to Local Patent Rule 3-4 and Section 10(d) of the Protective Order (Dkt. No. 103) and ASUS Technology Licensing, Inc.'s Motion to Compel Defendants to Produce Source Code Pursuant to Local Patent Rule 3-4 and Section 10(d) of the Protective Order (Dkt. No. 108). Mr. Sheasby for plaintiff. Warren Lipschitz for defendants.

After the break, Mr. Sheasby informed the Court of the outcome of their conference regarding unzipping the code. Mr. Lipschitz responded. The Court GRANTED the motions for the reasons orally assigned and ordered Ericsson to either produce in an unzipped fashion or produce on the portions that do not exceed 100 megabytes within two weeks.

ASUS Technology Licensing, Inc.'s Motion for Protective Order (Dkt. No. 122) was DENIED as moot.

Mr. Sheasby then argued ASUS Technology Licensing, Inc.'s Motion to Compel Defendants to Produce Source Code Parameter and Configuration Files (Dkt. No. 124). The Court GRANTED-IN-PART for the reasons orally assigned.

The Court then heard arguments on Celerity IP, LLC's Motion to Compel Interrogatory Responses (Dkt. No. 121). The motion was GRANTED-IN-PART and DENIED-IN-PART for the reasons orally assigned. Plaintiff withdrew its motion as to Interrogatories 10 and 12.